

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06064 071431Z

43

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00

NSC-05 ( ISO ) W

----- 048821

P R 071320Z NOV 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 4466

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 6064

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF COMMON

CEILING: SPC MEETING NOVEMBER 6

REFS: A. USNATO 5959 DTG 041305 Z NOV 75

B. STATE 262777 DTG 060026Z NOV 75

C. USDEL VIENNA 514 DTG 051400Z NOV 75

SUMMARY: SPC ON NOVEMBER 6 RETURNED TO APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE COMMON CEILING IN OPTION III. BELGIANS AGREED TO DROP THEIR SENTENCE FROM THE GUIDANCE ON TELLING THE EAST THAT THE COMBINED COMMON CEILING WAS PROPOSED HAVING IN MIND THAT THERE IS APPROPRIATE PARITY IN AIR MANPOWER. FRG REP REAFFIRMED THE IMPORTANCE THE FRG ATTACHES TO REGISTERING ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN THE POSITION PAPER. DUTCH CONTINUED TO RESIST THE COMPROMISE FORMULATION ON SEEKING AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I. END SUMMARY.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06064 071431Z

1. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) SAID BELGIUM COULD NOW ACCEPT THE COMPROMISE WHEREBY BELGIUM WOULD DROP THE BRACKETED SENTENCE IN THE FINAL TIC OF PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE (TEXT IN PARA 2, REF A) ON TELLING THE EAST THAT THE OFFER OF A COMBINED COMMON

CEILING WAS PROPOSED HAVING IN MIND THAT THERE IS AN APPROXIMATE  
APRITY IN AIR MANPOWER. SPC AGREED, AND THUS THE FINAL RACKETED  
SENTENCE IN THE FINAL TIE OF PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE  
DROPS OUT, AND THE BRACKETS ARE REMOVED FROM AROUND THE UK  
ADDITION TO THE US FOOTNOTE TO PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT POSITION  
PAPER (TEXT IN PARA 3, REF A). SINCE SPC AGREED AT LAST  
MEETING TO DELETE "ACCEPT AGREED" IN FAVOR  
OF "ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT REQUIRING", THE ONLY BRACKETED  
SENTENCE WITHIN THE FINAL TIC IS THE ONE STATING THAT AN  
UNDERSTANDING WOULD BE SOGHT IN PASE I ON THE LEVEL OF  
THE COMMON CEILING. AS NOTED BELOW, THE DUTCH CONTINUE TO  
FAVOR A SENTENCE ALONG THESE LINES.

2. FRG REP (HOYNCK) CALLED ATTENTION TO THE BRACKETED  
SENTENCE IN PARA 3 OF THE POSITIONPAPER CALLING FOR AGREEMENT  
WITH THE EAST ON THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS.  
HE SAID HE WANTED TO REMIND THE COMMITTEE OF THE IMPORTANCE  
THE FRG ATTACHES TO REGISTERING ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THIS  
POINT IN THE POSITION PAPER.

3. US REP (MOORE) MADE THE POINTS IN REF B IN SUPPROT OF THE  
SENTENCE IN PARA 3 OF THE POSITION PAPER ("IN THE COURSE  
OF PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS, AND SUBJECT TO LATER COUNCIL GUIDANCE  
ON THIS POINT, THE ALLIES SHOULD IN ADDITION SEEK A COMMON  
UNDERSTANDING WITH THE EAST AS TO THE PRECISE NUMERICAL  
LEVEL OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING TO BE REACHED FOLLOWING  
THE PHASE II REDUCTIONS"), AND THAT CURRENT GUIDANCE IN PARA 1  
OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE IS SUFFICIENT ON WHAT TO TELL THE EAST  
IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS. IN ENSUING DISUCSSION, HE ALSO  
DREW ON MUCH OF PARAS 2 TO 5, REF C.

4. UK REP (BAILES) SAID UK FOUND FULLY ACCEPTABLE THE  
SENTENCE IN QUESTION IN PARA 3 OF THE POSITION PAPER. UK  
WAS PLEASED THAT US HAD BEEN ABLE TO ACCEPT THIS SENTENCE,  
WHICH IN UK VIEW REPRESENTED A SIGNIFICAANT STEP  
FORWARD FROM THE ORIGINAL US COMPROMISE LANGUAGE THAT, IF  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06064 071431Z

"FEASIBLE", THE AHG "COULD" SEEK AN UNDERSTANDING WITH THE  
EAST ON THE LEVEL OF HE COMMON CEILING. UK AGREED  
FULLY WITH US THAT AHG SHOULD NOT SEEK AN UNDERSTANDING WITH THE  
EAST UNTIL THE NAC HAD AGREED ON A PRECISE FIGURE FOR RHE  
LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING. IN ADDITION, UK AGREED THAT  
IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO HAVA SENTENCE IN THE GUIDANCE  
REQUIRING AHG TO TELL THE OTHER SIDE THAT THE ALLIES WOULD  
SEEK AN UNDERSTANDING ON THIS MATTER IN PHASE I.

5. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES  
BELIEVED THE AHG SHOULD TELL THE OTHER SIDE IN INITIAL  
PRESENTATIONS THAT THE ALLIES WOULD SEEK AN UNDERSTANDING  
ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING. HE WAS ALSO TROUBLED BY  
THE US INABILITY TO ACCPET, IN THE SENTENCE IN QUESTION

IN PARA 3 OF THE POSITION PAPER, PLACING THE REFERENCE TO COUNCIL

APPROVAL AFTER THE REFERENCE TO THE PRECISE NUMERICAL LEVEL.  
HE SAID HE HAD GREAT DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING THE PRESISTENT  
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE US AND THE EUROPEANS ON APPROPRIATE  
DEFINITION OF THE COMMON CEILING.

6. CHAIRMAN (JUNG) SAID THAT HE DID NOT SEE  
THAT THIS WAS AN ISSUE BETWEEN THE US AND THE EUROPEANS, AND  
NOTED THAT ONE EUROPEAN, THE UK, HAD JUST SUPPORTED THE US  
POSITION.

7. FRG REP SAID THAT, RE THE NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARKS,  
THE FRRG, A EUROPEAN ALLY, HAD TAKEN THE US POINT ON  
PHASING, AND SHARED THE US VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT  
PRESS TOO STRONGLY ON GAINING AN UNDERSATANDING WITH THE EAST  
ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I. THE ONLY  
POSSIBLE DIFFERENCE REMAINING BETWEEN US AND FRG WAS HOW TO  
EXPRESS THE POSITION IN PARA 3 OF THE POSITION PAPER IN A TACTICAL  
FRAMEWORK WITH THE EAST. HE COULD NOT COMMENT ON THE US  
VIEW THAT CURRENT GUIDANCE IN PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE  
IS SUFFICIENT ON WHAT TO TELL THE EAST IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS.  
THIS WAS ONLY BECUASE HE HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS,  
BUT THAT DID NOT MEAN THAT THERE WOLD BE ANY DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN  
FRG AND US ON THIS POINT.

8. WE HAD LONG DISCUSSION WITH DUTCH REP LATER IN THE AY RE  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06064 071431Z

THE US POSITION IN REF B. HE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THIS EMARK  
ON PERSISTENT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN US AND EUROPEANS DID NOT  
REFLECT WHAT HE MEANT. HE STRESSED THE DEEP DUTCH COMMITMENT  
TO THE COMMON CEILING, AND THE DUTCH CONCERN THAT OPTION III  
OFFERED THE ALLIES THEIR BEST CHANCE TO OBTAIN EASTERN  
AGREEMENT TO THE KIND OF COMMON CEILING THE ALLIES WANTED.  
HE WONDERED IF THE COMMON CEILING COULD ACTUALLY BE OBTAINED  
IN PHASE II IF THE ALLIES HAD ALREADY USED OPTION III FOR  
SOMETHING ELSE. WE WENT OVER ALL OF THE US ARGUMENTS WITH  
DUTCH REP, EMPHASING THE DISTANCE THE USE HAD COME ON THIS  
ISSUE, AND THE FACT THAT THE PRESENT PARA 3 OF THE POSITION  
PAPER OFFERS THE ONLY BASIS FOR A SOLUTION. HE APPEARED TO  
RECOGNIZE THAT, REALISTICALLY, THE DUTCH WOULD HAVE TO  
MOVE ON THIS ISSUE.  
STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 07 NOV 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** greeneet  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO06064  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19751189/abbrznai.tel  
**Line Count:** 157  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 5959 DTG 041305 Z NOV 75 B. STATE 262777 DTG 060026Z NOV 75 C. USDEL VIENNA 514 DTG 051400Z NOV 75  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** greeneet  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: OPTION III: APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF COMMON CEILING: SPC MEETING NOVEMBER 6  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE PRIORITY  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006